DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 316 IR 005 837

AUTHOR Kleingartner, Archie; And Others
TITLE LAUC Seminars on Career Development for Academic Librarians.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. Librarians Association.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Librarians; Library Research; Professional Personnel; *Professional Recognition; Promotion (Occupational); Seminars; *University Libraries; *Vocational Development

ABSTRACT

During 1976-77, the Berkeley Division of the Librarians Association of the University of California sponsored four seminars on career development for academic librarians. The speakers and their topics were: Archie Kleingartner (Vice President for Academic and Staff Personnel Relations, University of California), "The professional in the institutional setting"; William F. McCoy (Assistant University Librarian for Personnel, University of California, Davis), "Career expectations for librarians in the University of California"; Page Ackerman (then University Librarian, U.C.L.A.), "The responsibility of the individual and the obligation of the institution in developing a professional library career"; and Gail Ann Schlachter (Assistant University Librarian for Public Services, University of California, Davis), "Research and the inquiring librarian." The remarks of the four speakers, along with questions and answers which followed their presentations, have been brought together and edited with an introduction by Richard S. Cooper, 1977 Chair of the Berkeley Division. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152316

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley

LAUC SEMINARS ON CAREER DEVELOPMENT FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS

Archie Kleingartner
William F. McCoy
Page Ackerman
Gail Ann Schlachter

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda Beaupre

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Edited with an introduction by Richard S. Cooper

IR005837

Berkeley

1977

Librarians Association of the University of California, Berkeley

LAUC SEMINARS ON CAREER DEVELOPMENT FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS

November 4, 1976 :	Archie Kleingartner, The Professional in the institutional setting
November 10, 1976:	William F. McCoy, Career expectations for librarians in the University of California
December 16, 1976:	Page Ackerman, The Responsibility of the individual and the obligation of the institution in developing a professional library career
February 10, 1977:	Gail Ann Schlachter, Research and the inquiring librarian

Edited with an introduction by Richard S. Cooper

Berkeley

1977

INTRODUCTION

Where do academic librarians -- those responsible for the collections of large research libraries -- stand within the structure of the university? Except for the teaching faculty, no other group of professionals in the university has as profound an effect as librarians on the educational experience of students. Their impact on the research collections and research activities of scholars cannot be overlooked. No one questions the duties and responsibilities of librarians, yet no one is quite certain of what their status is vis-à-vis the faculty. The debate over librarians' status in the university has gone on at three distinct and consecutive levels: 1) is librarianship a profession or vocation?; 2) are librarians academic?; 3) how academic are they?

The issue dates from the latter part of the last century, when such influential figures as librarian Justin Winsor, Professor Henry James and Johns Hopkins University President Daniel Coit Gilman wrote that academic librarianship should be a profession in its own right. Librarians, they argued, should be partners with the classroom faculty in the educational process. Unfortunately "academic" librarians were not yet ready for this role, and clung to the "housekeeping" approach to librarianship until the 1920s. In 1923 the Williamson Report called for considerable improvement in library education, and five years later the Graduate Library School was established in Chicago with the first doctoral program in library science. Elsewhere, library education did not show much improvement until the 1940s.

Another development of the 1940s was the discussion of faculty status for librarians, and at first this idea met with considerable opposition. A moderate position held that academic librarianship was a true profession, but was different from and could stand apart from the faculty as an independent, but equal group in the university. This was the position taken by Berkeley University Librarian Donald Coney and, while there was a move towards faculty status for librarians in other parts of the country, the University of California solution was to accord librarians academic status in 1962.

By 1970, no clear indication had as yet emerged as to the meaning of "academic," but developments of the next few years brought the issue to the forefront of questions vexing the ranks of UC librarians. The initiation of peer review for promotion and advancement signaled that librarians would have a say as to whom was to be admitted to their ranks and be rewarded by advancement, one of the hallmarks of a true profession. The criteria for advancement were formalized in the University's Academic Personnel Manual, followed by several years of anguished struggle attempting to interpret and apply the criteria in practice. Next the librarians' series was restructured to parallel the faculty structure, and review procedures closely resembling faculty advancement reviews have developed. The key language of the Academic Personnel Manual states that "a candidate for merit increase or review shall be judged on the basis of the first of the following criteria, and, to the extent they are relevant, on one or more

of the last three: i) professional competence and quality of service within the library; ii) professional activity outside the library; iii) University and public service; iv) research and other creative activity". (Section 51-4-e(3)

The guidelines were in existence for several years before any problems arose in their application. In 1974, librarians of the Berkeley campus were stunned to learn that a stringent interpretation of the criteria was applied to the promotion and advancement decisions completed in that year, and were apprised by University Librarian Richard M. Dougherty that the single most important factor in the low number of advancements and promotions that year was the lack of adequate documentation. Uppermost in everyone's mind for the next several years was the problem of defining, measuring and documenting professional growth. The first attempt to formulate an answer was the creation of a special committee, which solicited information from the entire professional staff and issued in November, 1974, the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion Review to the Executive Committee of the Librarians Assembly, University of California, Berkeley. This report, despite hostility to some of its provisions and its rejection as a plan of action, rendered its most valuable service in supplying documentation guidelines which have since been the basis for preparing the dossiers of candidates for promotion or advancement. The criteria for evaluation were, necessarily, vague, while the body of academic librarians cast about for suitable answers to the question, "what must I do to be promoted?"

The shock waves enamating from Berkeley were being felt throughout the state in the following years, with the result that in 1975 the statewide

Librarians Association of the University of California (LAUC) instructed its Committee on Salaries, Privileges and Conditions of Employment to draft a position paper on the criteria for promotion from Associate to Librarian, and in subsequent years parallel position papers on promotion to Associate Librarian, and the top step of the Librarian rank, were formulated and adopted by the association. Since the criteria were vague, in order to provide as flexible a document as possible which could withstand the tests of time and change, the debate continued.

As envisioned by the drafters of the LAUC position papers, the dialogue itself contributed to an evolving concept of excellence. Each year new problems arose and found answers, though the answers found one year may have been inadequate the next, owing to the constantly changing expectations of both staff and administration. In the most dynamic period librarianship has ever undergone, owing to technological advances, legislation, demands of the client community, budgetary constraints, and uncertainty about the demarcation between professional and paraprofessional tasks, it could hardly be expected that the criteria for advancement would remain static.

The Berkeley division of LAUC (LAUC-B) perceived in 1976 that the key issue for academic librarians at Berkeley was career development, and that there was a need to provide some guidance to the possible choice of activities which would indicate professional growth and in turn lead to advancement. What was wanted was an ongoing dialogue in which the profession could continually re-define itself. Though it would appear that the immediate concern was to anticipate issues and defuse them before they became problems

or even crises in the peer review process, peer review was seen as only a part of the wider issue of professional identity. LAUC-B thus sought to create a forum for exploration of the issues. The result was a planned series of discussions keynoted by speakers who were themselves deeply involved in the articulation of professional careers in academic librarianship, or the evolution of performance standards. Four speakers were asked to address specific issues in the LAUC Seminars on Career Development for Academic Librarians.

The mark of the professional is independence and a wide degree of discretion in decision-making, yet some professions can best be pursued within an institutional framework or are so closely linked to institutional structures that they could rarely be practiced apart from them. This being characteristic of librarianship, the first issue which needed examination was the collegial and heirarchical considerations of the professional in the institutional setting. As the individual who is responsible at the University statewide level for all personnel matters affecting librarians' status and welfare is also an expert on professions and professionalism, our first speaker was Dr. Archie Kleingartner, Vice President for Academic and Staff Personnel Relations.

The second issue, raised by the restructuring of the Librarian's series accompanied by a significant improvement in salaries at the University of California, was the question of the individual librarian's career expectations. Librarians were being noticed, but recognition carried with it the responsibility to demonstrate merit, and the necessity for codification of procedures and criteria. More stringent criteria affect librarians at two

points in their careers. The first point is promotion from Assistant to Associate Librarian, which carries with it "career status" and implies continuity of employment. Not to be promoted at this stage or not to achieve career status means the termination of a librarian's employment with the University. The second point is promotion from Associate Librarian to Librarian, and is implicitly understood to be a step which will not be taken by all librarians, though there is plenty of disagreement as to where this "natural stopping place" is located in the ranks and steps of the librarians series. Mr. William McCoy, Associate University Librarian for Personnel at Davis, chairman of the committee which undertook the restructuring of the librarians' series and a member of the Personnel Subcommittee of Library Council and the Universitywide Staff Personnel Board, was asked to address this issue.

In our third seminar, the issue was one raised in the discussions which followed the issuance of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion Review. The reservations of the professional staff were succinctly stated in the following paragraph from one of the contra statements:

> "Some librarians apparently feel that the overall tenor of the Report is to define roles and performance standards for librarians which are unrealistically ambitious. These librarians are skeptical of the Report's assumption that 'every librarian will be given the opportunity for professional growth.' They fear we are putting ourselves in an increasingly difficult position--agreeing to assume more and more new tasks without any real assurance from administration that there will be commensurate reductions in other workloads."

What are the responsibilities of the individual librarian and the obligations of management in developing a professional career? Asked to address this question was one of our colleagues who has had a long and distinguished career,

in the course of which she has seen and considered both sides of the coin, UCLA University Librarian Page Ackerman.

The literature on faculty status for librarians reveals that, regardless of whether or not academic librarians are accorded faculty titles, they are judged by some of the same criteria used to evaluate faculty. The debate is less over which criteria than over how much of each criteria, with the major question being to what extent librarians should be involved in research, what kinds of research, how much, and how to evaluate it. In our final seminar, Dr. Gail Schlachter, newly appointed Assistant University Librarian for Public Service at Davis who has published much of her own research, delivered a very challenging presentation on librarians and research.

In issuing these four papers with a summary of the discussions, it is the hope of the LAUC Program Committee that academic librarians everywhere will be benefited in their reflections on the nature of their professional involvement, and the shape they wish to give their individual careers.

Richard S. Cooper

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The idea for this series of seminars was generated in collaboration with Jan Powell, who has since joined the staff of the University of Maryland. Our proposal was endorsed by LAUC-B and subsequently submitted to our Staff Development Committee which generously provided funding with the approval of the University Librarian, Richard M. Dougherty. I wish to thank Lan Dyson, Dorothy Gregor, Rita Kane and Geri Scalzo who joined me as the LAUC Program Committee to plan and implement these seminars. We are indebted to Dorothy Gregor, Rita Kane, and especially Eva Carroad for the careful transcription of the addresses and following discussions, and to Evelyn Wright for preparing the manuscript. Finally, my thanks to the speakers for sharing their ideas with us, and for revising our notes or in some cases providing us with the written texts of their statements.

R.S.C.

November 4, 1976

LIBRARIANS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

SEMINAR ON CAREER DEVELOPMENT FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS

DR. ARCHIE KLEINGARTNER, VICE-PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC & STAFF PERSONNEL RELATIONS

SUBJECT: The Professional in the institutional setting; Problems facing the professional operating simultaneously in collegial and hierarchial situations.

The topic assumes that the professionals are also employees in an organization. An important issue for the professional in the institutional setting is the desire to exert professional perogatives, which ofter center around degrees of control. Hierarchial organizations tend toward rule-making, have a chain of command, and must stress accountability. This comes in conflict with the desire of professionals to be autonomous. Three points should be considered when trying to understand the relationship of professionals with their organizations:

1. There is a significant distinction to be made between professionals in a university, for example, and those in an industrial setting.
2. The degree of professionalism will effect the inherent tension and reconcilability of issues between these individuals and their respective organizations.
3. The availability of mechanisms for resolving conflicts is an important factor in the relationship between professionals and their organization.

The University is distinct from other organizations because there is an emphasis on collegial relationships. The collegial setting has unique characteristics, e.g. time-consuming participatory practices and high trust

requirements. There are time pressures on university administrators which create pressures to run a smooth, efficient operation. Stress is increased by the conflicting demands of the professionals and the university organization.

There should be a mechanism through which the interests of each group can be communicated. LAUC would be one example of an appropriate communication channel. For librarians to achieve a more legitimate collegial place in the university, their role must expand beyond personnel concerns. For example, library planning is one general area where broad professional concerns can be demonstrated. In faculty circles work on curriculum development would be an example of broader professional participation.

In the ensuing question-and-answer period, the topics discussed can be subsumed under the following rubrics:

WORKLOADS

Q. Librarians' work loads have a non-professional component often of considerable size. What are your thoughts on this?

A. All professions exhibit similar characteristics. Economically, however, it is a misuse of human talent. Large non-professional workloads are probably a disincentive to the professional.

Q. Work structure and job design in libraries are such that professional development goals must be undercut in pursuit of more day-to-day operational activities. The only alternative is to sacrifice personal time and energies to keep up with the need to develop professionally. Can some kind of accomodation be made?

A. One response would be to add clerical staff. The library profession itself should attempt to recommend solutions.

SABBATICALS

An enquiry concerned the possibility of sabbaticals for librarians. It is an important prerogative of the faculty, and a perquisite which relates to their core function. The discussion emphasized that there are avenues for release time which have not been fully exploited by librarians.

MORE RIGOROUS REVIEWS

Q. Where does the pressure to have more rigor in the review process come from?

A. Part of the professional ethos is the setting of rigorous standards and the definition of a professional ethic. This should be developed by the profession itself. There is no question that administrators have a responsibility to maintain the quality of their staff, but the idea behind peer review is that professionals themselves have an important stake in the quality of their profession.

SUPPORT STAFF

A comment from the audience pointed out that librarians do not have the support necessary to promote their professional interests. Mr. Kleingartner responded that this had to be explained in terms of the fiscal situation. This issue was raised at several points in the ensuing discussions, in which it became clear that the ratio of support to professional staff, though key to the problem, could not easily or rapidly be altered. A prior hurdle is to clarify what constitutes the distinction between professional and non-professional work in libraries.

CONFIDENTIALITY

A representative of the San Francisco campus raised the problem of confidentiality and lack of feed-back in the peer review process. The situation, of course, differs from campus to campus. Mr. Kleingartner responded that confidentiality does not preclude the giving of information regarding the content of a review to a candidate. In fact, this is the supervisor's responsibility.

Elaborating further on the subject of confidentiality, Mr. Kleingartner noted that the University hopes to soon have a comprehensive policy statement on the kinds of records that are to be considered confidential. Review and promotion procedures for the faculty will no doubt retain elements of confidentiality, since lack of anonymity would have a chilling effect on the candor of the reviewer and the rigor of the critique. The overriding consideration in personnel evaluation systems is that there be some mechanism for providing a critical review while at the same time affording the subject access to the substance of his or her review. This can only be effected when the source of an evaluation is protected by confidentiality.

We are working towards a system in which the content, but not the authorship of appraisals are known to candidates. The simple fact is that there is no incentive for candor if the source of evaluation is known to the candidate. For the same reason, verbatim committee reports cannot be released because they may contain an indication of authorship.

PEER REVIEW

It takes perhaps 10 years to develop a peer review system. It is probable that some librarians do not wish peer review to work because it is new and

unfamiliar, and because negative peer decisions can be very painful. Peer review depends on shared values.

ROLE OF LAUC

LAUC and the Academic Senate have several roles; e.g. personnel matters and long range planning. At the system-wide level LAUC has contributed in a number of important ways to policy development.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Asked what kind of bargaining groups he would favor constituting under collective bargaining, Mr. Kleingartner responded that groups should be as large as possible. He feels, however, that it is not a question of what ideology University Hall has, but of what the politics are of groups already constituted. Librarians may or may not be included with faculty depending on what each perceived their interests to be. The University-wide administration is not opposed to collective bargaining, but is opposed to the provisions of some of the bills which have been introduced.

CAREER EXPECTATIONS FOR LIBRARIANS
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Some weeks ago I received a letter from Richard Cooper asking if I would be willing to participate in one of the career development seminars the Berkeley Division of LAUC is sponsoring this fall. He suggested the general topic of "What is a reasonable career expectation" and suggested I be prepared to field questions on the concept of the Associate Librarian rank as a "natural stopping place" for some librarians. He kindly observed that I was at liberty regarding the formality or informality of my remarks and the length thereof, but that I could expect a dialogue of some three hours with you. My formal remarks will be relatively brief; the extent of the dialogue is up to you.

What then is a "reasonable career expectation" for an appointee in the Librarian Series? It seems to me neither inappropriate nor unrealistic to say that every librarian joining the University of California can aspire to the rank of full Librarian, i.e., librarian with a capital "L". Please note with care, however, simple aspiration does not mean every librarian will or, for that matter, should reach that rank. Is there a contradiction in these statements? Permit me to explain why I believe there is not.

As most of us are aware, specific criteria relating to the appointment, retention, and advancement of librarians are listed in sections 51-4 and 82-10 of the University's Academic Personnel Manual. To refresh my memory as well as yours, section 82-10 states, in part:

Criteria

a. A candidate for appointment shall have a professional back ground of competence, knowledge, and experience to assure suitability for appointment to this series. Such background will normally include a professional degree from a library school with an accredited program. However, a person with other appropriate degree(s) or equivalent

experience in one or more fields relevant to library services may also be appointed to this series.

b. A candidate for merit increase or promotion in this series shall be judged on the basis of the first of the following criteria, and, to the extent they are relevant, on one or more of the last three:
   (1) professional competence and quality of service within the library;
   (2) professional activity outside the library;
   (3) University and public service; and
   (4) research and other activity.
   In the consideration of individual candidates, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised in weighing the comparative relevance of these criteria.

c. Demonstrated superior professional ability and attainment are indispensable qualifications for promotion to the ranks of Associate Librarian and Librarian. However, such promotion should be justified not only by excellence of service and attainment, but also by demonstrated professional growth and accomplishment and/or the assumption of greater responsibility.

d. An explanation of these criteria is set forth in Section 51-4.

The language of section 82 indicates clearly that the procedures for conducting salary and promotion reviews are to be developed at the campus level, thus there is no uniform University-wide policy or procedure in this regard. Whether this is or is not desirable has been the subject of much talk amongst librarians in the past, but reality dictates we deal with the established pattern as it exists today. Each of the campus libraries has developed a system for making appointments and conducting personnel reviews, including salary actions and promotions, that involves--in one form or another--written evaluations and peer review by colleagues within the library. One campus, Davis, has an additional

review conducted by the Budget and Personnel Affairs Committee of the Academic Staff Organization, which is composed of all half-time or more academic appointees who are not members of the Academic Senate.

I make no claim that the review procedures as they exist today are perfect; few things in which human beings play so large a role are. But I submit those procedures are appreciably better and less subject to manipulation than might be the case if salary actions and promotions were left to the sole discretion of administrators. The present system of reviews, with all its attendant paperwork, does provide for differentiation in reward between those who combine superior performance of their specific assignment with professional activity, service, or research and those who, by personal choice, elect to concentrate their energies on their specific assignment alone. I might add that provision is also made for those who fail to perform their specific assignment in a satisfactory manner.

I am aware that the University's Staff Personnel Board recently recommended abandonment of merit salary review for staff employees and replacing that system with an anniversary plan wherein an employee rendering satisfactory performance would receive a 5% salary increase and an employee whose work performance was unsatisfactory would receive no increase. Such a plan seems relatively simple when compared with the review procedures for librarians, but even it requires the exercise of judgment regarding who should and should not receive that 5% increase.

I believe we should not lose sight of the fact that there is a significant difference in the philosophy of classification between academic and staff positions. In crudely simple terms, the academic employee has the opportunity to reach the top of her/his title series while discharging the same responsibilities throughout an entire career. The staff employee almost always must undertake changes in assignment to achieve the top of her/his title series via promotion. There is no possibility of a Library Assistant moving from LA I to LA IV while retaining the

same position responsibilities. This differing philosophy of classification is predicated upon the fact that a staff employee is judged for salary increase on the basis of her/his performance in a particular job assignment while an academic employee is judged on that basis plus other criteria such as those stipulated in sections 51-4 and 82-10 of the Manual.

Many of us can remember the period prior to July 1962 when librarians were classified as non-academic employees. The performance of one's given job assignment was really all that mattered in obtaining salary increases and advancement and, you may remember, we could advance all the way from Librarian I to the rarefied height of Librarian II on that basis. Librarian III, IV, and V were ranks rarely invaded by those who did not have supervisory responsibility.

The adoption of the provisions of section 82 in July 1972 provided the framework for our present three-rank system of titles and introduced the concept of a "two-track" system of advancement for all librarians in which supervision and/or management was only one of five alternatives, the other being (1) selection and development of resources, (2) bibliographical control of collections and their organization for use, (3) reference and advisory services, and (4) development and application of specialized information systems. Every librarian in the University's service fits into one or more of these slots; thus, the "two-track" system is open to all.

It seems illogical to me for us, as librarians, to state on the one hand that we want the benefits of the "two-track" system in combination with the scope/review that pertains to staff employee positions. The coupling of greater tangible reward, i.e., the present salary schedule, with greater accountability for receipt of that reward does not seem onerous. I am aware the present salary schedule is not perfect; indeed, the final report of the Special Committee to Study Librarian Salaries, dated 19 April 1975, stated, and I quote, "We wish to reiterate our view that

inequity will continue to exist after the restructure and that the University should continue to attempt to eliminate that inequity in the coming year." At the same time, I cannot concur with the view of some who would have us believe the present schedule is little more than a cosmetic repair of the schedule that existed prior to July 1975. The October 1976 issue College & Research Libraries News shows that the average salary in university libraries for non-supervisory librarians who have five or more years service is $14,425; a librarian with only five years service in the University of California system--having received no accelerated increases--is earning $15,804. The salary restructure of July 1975 provided for substantial improvement in the salaries of all ranks and made our schedule competitive with, or better than, those of virtually all other academic jurisdictions. I recognize that we are not at the Olympian heights of the City University of New York salary scale. On the other hand, we should keep two points in mind. First, the senior rank of full Professor in that system is presently held by only 9 individuals. Second, the top salary of the Associate Professor rank, i.e., the rank at which most C.U.N.Y. librarians will "top out," is approximately $28,500, which is less than $500 above the top salary step for full Librarians in the University.

When the salary schedule was restructured the upper limit of the Associate Librarian rank was substantially increased. Members of the Special Committee believed that was necessary as we did not assume every appointee in the Series would eventually hold the rank of full Librarian. At the same time we wished to provide what, for want of a better adjective, might be termed a "respectable" salary for those for whom the rank of Associate Librarian is a "natural stopping place" because their professional commitment was not extended beyond their specific responsibilities. This, then, is the crux of the matter. Why did the Special Committee deem unrealistic the assumption that everyone would eventually become a full Librarian? Quite simply, the answer is that we believed, and I certainly continue to believe, that differential effort should receive differential reward.

Earlier in my remarks I stated that not every librarian would, or should reach the rank of full Librarian. That statement is predicated upon the observation that although each of us, by virtue of our appointment in the University's Librarian Series, may be presumed to have the potential for such achievement, it is highly unlikely that each of us will be willing to put forth the time, effort, and, in some instances, the sacrifice necessary to realize that potential. I noted earlier that section 82 outlines specific criteria for appointment, retention, and advancement. Chief amongst those criteria, a sine qua non if you will, is demonstrated superior professional ability and attainment in one's specific service area and evidence of superior quality of service within the library. In simple terms, it is expected and requisite that all librarians who hold a continuing appointment in the University perform their basic assignment in a superior manner. It is also assumed that failure to so perform, if proven after careful review, will result in the separation of those in potential career status and the termination of those in career status, as provided in section 82. Continued appointment in the Librarian Series is not predicated upon professional activity outside the library, University or public service, or published research if one's demonstrated professional competence and quality of service are superior. Those activities, in point of fact, serve to distinguish those librarians who may find a "natural stopping place" in the Associate Librarian rank from those who are promoted to full Librarian.

You will note that I have distinguished between Associate Librarian and full Librarian. What of the distinction between Assistant Librarian, most of whom today are in potential career status, and Associate Librarian, which, if achieved by means of promotion, confers career status upon one. In my mind the move from Assistant Librarian to Associate Librarian is of equal importance with the move from Associate to full Librarian. Indeed, in one way it may be more important, for failure to advance to Associate Librarian results in the end of one's service as a librarian in the University.

I believe less emphasis should be placed upon criteria 2, 3, and 4 of section 82-10 in the promotion to Associate Librarian than should be the case in the promotion to full Librarian. At present many Assistant Librarians are promoted at the close of their fourth year of service, which means, in terms of our review processes, they are recommended for such promotion when they have little more than 42 months of experience. As new members of the profession, which the majority of Assistant Librarians are, they are not yet well known in professional organizations and have some handicap in being appointed to Association boards, committees, or councils. They face the same problem, to a degree, in serving on campus-wide or Systemwide University committees and task forces. The probability of their doing research and publication is slight unless they have material from another academic endeavor, e.g., graduate work in another discipline, upon which they can draw. Service on library committees and committees of their own LAUC division, or even Statewide LAUC committees, is usually available and often constitutes the chief "beyond the desk" performance of an Assistant Librarian.

By contrast with the time span for promotion of Assistant Librarians, most Associate Librarians will have no less than eleven years in the profession prior to consideration for promotion to full Librarian. This should be sufficient time for a person to make her/his mark in some endeavor beyond the specific responsibilities of the position held.

What of the point of view held by some which can be summarized by the statement "I'll put in my regular working hours, but the rest of my time is my own and how I spend it should not influence the career potential I can expect." I cannot accept that view with regard to the individual expectation for advancement to the full Librarian rank. If we are members of a profession and wish to be regarded as professionals we should not make adherence to an 8 to 5 schedule the primary concern of our working lives. As professionals we should have concerns and interests that transcend our specific responsibilities in a given library. Assuming like quality of performance, those who contribute significant professional

accomplishments, which are almost always done outside one's regular assignment, by definition, deserve to be rewarded in a different manner from those who adhere to the 40 hour week and do no more nor no less than is stipulated in their job descriptions.

In summary, then, let me reiterate that every appointee in the Librarian series has a "reasonable career expectation" of becoming a full Librarian. Indeed, I would hope that every appointee would so aspire, for that is the type of colleague who will be of greatest benefit to both her/his peers and to the University. At the same time, aspiration without perspiration is not enough. More than simple performance in the assigned job, no matter how well done, must be considered in the promotion of librarians to the highest rank.

Thank you. I shall be happy to attempt to answer your questions.

Wm. F. McCoy

November, 1976

Question and Answer Session

Q: May I ask you to clarify the idea that academic employees do not necessarily change the nature of their jobs as they are promoted through the system, whereas other staff must change their duties in order to be promoted.

A: The librarian must demonstrate a commitment beyond the specific responsibilities required by the job. This commitment then enlarges the role of the librarian even if the library job itself has undergone little redefinition.

Q: Given that a criterion for advancement is the assumption of greater responsibility, it is unclear whether the assumption of greater responsibility automatically leads to promotion. When does promotion take place: before or after the demonstrated assumption of responsibility?

A: It seems appropriate to expect some demonstration of competence before promotion. One complication of this prerequisite is recruitment of a person who will accept this greater responsibility without the assurance of promotion.

Q: With regard to Points 2, 3, and 4 of Section 82, shouldn't these sections be important factors even in the promotion of Assistant to Associate Librarian? Knowledge of the profession is enhanced by participation in committee work and professional associations.

A: This is certainly important and should not be overlooked. It is likely that such involvement will lead to better on-the-job performance and will naturally lead to rewards (promotion).

Q: Is it ethical for people to squeeze job activities in order to accommodate extra professional work?

A: There are some professional positions which lend themselves more readily to involvement in extra activities. For example, persons engaged in innovative projects have more opportunity to publish the results of such undertakings than do persons who are engaged in more routine functions. Admittedly, this situation is somewhat unfair. For this and other reasons, it is unwise for a person to stay in one position at the outset of his/her career.

Q: Are there people in the UC system who have been promoted to the rank of Librarian without involvement in extra activities?

A: No, at least not at Davis. There may be a few exceptions in other libraries, but this should not be the case.

Q: Given that employees must have a demonstrated commitment to the library profession, individuals may have to reckon with extra time being devoted to such activities. If a person does show this commitment, can he/she expect to reach the Librarian rank?

A: Yes, there should be no limit placed on the number of Librarians. Any person deserving of the title should expect to attain this status.

Q: Are there enough steps in the current librarian series to encompass the entire career of a librarian from Assistant (straight out of Library School) to full Librarian?

A: Yes, the present three ranks of librarians did open up sufficient career possibilities for librarians.

Q: How does the librarian series compare to faculty steps in terms of the number of years covered?

A: Unable to answer this question precisely. There are definite differences in the frequency of evaluations; professors are evaluated every two years at the beginning of their university career, as opposed to every year for librarians. Although the professor titles include a Professor V rank, it must be noted that this step is reserved for very special cases (e.g., Nobel Prize winners).

Q: Was it the intent of the Committee in setting the Librarian scale to reserve steps IV and V as an extraordinary rank for extraordinary merit?

A: There is at the present time a LAUC Ad Hoc Committee on the Top Step of the Librarian Rank which will address itself to this matter. The Committee will clarify criteria for the top steps. It is not possible to establish precise criteria for all promotions; there must be some allowance for flexibility while at the same time laying down the guidelines which will cover most cases.

Q: (Comment) It was extremely difficult for the Committee to obtain approval for the top salary from the University Administration.

A: The main point of the Committee's work was to raise the salary of the top Associate step, recognizing that for many librarians this is the last step.

Q: Last year, LAUC concentrated on the promotion criteria for Associate to full Librarian. This year, the primary focus was on the step from Assistant to Associate Librarian. The latter document would seem to state that the criteria for promotion from Assistant to Associate are basically the same as from Associate to Librarian, but "less." Further clarification of this document is necessary.

A: As Assistant Librarian, the main job is to learn all aspects of the position very well. Since the Assistant Librarian is in the "up-or-out" situation, the library must have good criteria for distinguishing between the promising employee and the person who should not be retained; in such cases, Points 2, 3, and 4 come into play.

Q: (Comment) There is some fear that the review process is not judged to be rigorous enough in the eyes of the University. In comparison to the faculty review process, which treats the promotion of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor very seriously, the library system turns down relatively few of its promotion applications for the Assistant to Associate rank. In part, this is due to the fact that Assistant Librarian positions are being filled with well-qualified persons who deserve the promotion.

Q: Are promotions dependent on the library budget?

A: If a person is deserving of promotion, but the only reason for rejecting this promotion is the budget, there should be a "cloak" to cover such a situation. There should be no relation between the budget and promotion. Several years ago at Davis, there was a severe budget restriction, however, this has not occurred since that time.

Q: What do you understand "Career Status" to mean?

A: There is nothing which spells out the definition of "Career Status" and certainly there are as many interpretations as there are librarians. Although it may be interpreted to be somewhat equivalent to tenure, it does not confer employment security if the funds being used to pay the employee are withdrawn (such as positions which are paid out of "soft money"). "Career Status" confers upon the employee continued employment with continued good performance at the university.

Q: In the classification of staff, there are two problems which emerge: there are professionals doing non-professional work and non-professionals doing professional work. How is this situation to be addressed?

A: After examining library activities on several campuses, it becomes readily apparent that this is the case. There are, for instance, Library Assistants III and IV doing original cataloging; they are sitting next to Associate Librarians who are doing the same kind of work.

Library Assistant and Staff Advisory Committee is very active in the area of examination of duties being performed by LA's on all the UC campuses. If the librarians do not undertake to define "professionalism" this may be done for them!

It is no longer possible for an employer to require arbitrarily that an employee must have an M.L.S. unless it can be demonstrated that the degree is <u>needed</u> to do the job.

A discussion of the M.L.S. ensued, with the following points made by various speakers:

1) MLS may be unnecessary altogether.
2) Can LA's be laterally transferred to Librarian series?
3) MLS curriculum should stress the total professional picture, rather than just library tasks. Should instill in its students a feeling for the profession, its organizations, etc.
4) The MLS gives students an overall picture of librarianship. LA's may master one particular skill with the same degree of proficiency as an MLS person. However, the person with an MLS should have the ability to look at each function with an understanding of how it fits into the total operation of the library system.

A discussion of the Library Assistant series brought forth the following comments:

1) There are many LA positions which by the nature of the job duties, should be classified at the Clerical series.
2) It is difficult for persons classified as LA's to transfer to clerical positions within the University. They are considered to be too specialized.

3) There are problems associated with the fact that there is only one probationary period for non-academic staff members. This discourages administrators from hiring persons who have passed this period in some other library, unless their recommendations are from a "reliable" source.

Q: Would it be appropriate for LAUC to set up minimum standards for hiring "librarians" to staff departmental libraries not under the jurisdiction on the General Library?

A: This is a matter to take up with Vice President Kleingartner. Economic factors play the chief role in the fact that persons with the MLS are willing to accept positions which are not classified as librarian positions.

Q: There are probably some Librarians who were given this rank in the past, but no longer deserve to be classified as such. As libraries change, people may not keep in touch with new developments. What rules are there that would prevent a person who has attained career status from being retained within the system if his/her competence can no longer be demonstrated?

A: Career status does not protect that sort of behavior. Section 82-17 of the Academic Personnel Manual contains language which permits the establishment of specific ad hoc committees to review the performance of librarians in career status who may not be performing their assignments in a satisfactory manner. Moreover, the section implies that failure to perform in a satisfactory manner may be grounds for dismissal. Implementation of section 82 is, of course, dependent upon supervisors and department heads, plus review boards and the library administration, being willing to assume the burden of citing unsatisfactory performance.

Q: There will be whole functions within the library which will be phased out over time. Will employees be re-trained for other positions, and if re-training is necessary, what will happen to the career of the individual faced with this change of career direction?

A: There will have to be an understanding on the part of the administration that a reasonable re-training period is necessary.

Q: Will there be a great deal of rotation of personnel within the library system?

A: This is not a simple matter. It is conceivable that there will be more such activity in the future. There is a Task Group to investigate the feasibility of rotations.

LAUC SEMINAR -DECEMBER 16, 1976

Page Ackerman was introduced by Richard Cooper. Ms. Ackerman was asked to address the topic: "The responsibility of the individual and the obligation of the institution in developing a professional library career." To do this, Ms. Ackerman posed seven questions and provided answers to them based on reflections of her own working life.

I. HOW DO YOU KNOW WHETHER YOU HAVE HAD A CAREER OR JUST A SUCCESSION OF WORK EXPERIENCES? ARE THERE IDENTIFIABLE ELEMENTS WHICH CHARACTERIZE A CAREER?

There are at least four major elements which characterize a career:

1) Time. The word "career" comes from the French, meaning "road" and from the Latin, meaning "wagon." Both express some sense of continuity in time. One may have two or three careers during a lifetime, and it will probably become more common for persons to have multiple careers.

2) Direction. This is the feeling that one has "gotten somewhere from somewhere" - that the direction was sustained (momentum).

3) Competence. In some way, one must have developed a competence or an array of competencies. Acquiring this competence must have been a cumulative experience, building on skills or knowledge from the past. There are two types of competence: one which pertains directly to job responsibilities and one which may be considered "individual competence" - knowledge and skills necessary not only for present work, but also for the future.

4) Contribution. One would identify this element as being the kind of contribution which goes beyond the job. It should be perceived both by you and by others. The nature of the contribution might be related to one's job or be relevant to outside activities of the profession. There are three levels of contributions: 1-Organizational (for the organization in which one is employed, but going beyond the expected job responsibilities), 2-Professional (a role within the professional structure), and 3-Social (librarianship has a social significance and therefore contributions to society can be made).

II. HOW DO YOU KNOW WHETHER YOU HAVE MET THESE FOUR REQUIREMENTS?

The most important source of information is yourself; only you have comprehensive knowledge of what you have done and are now doing. The organization in which you work will reflect signals to you about your competence and contribution; this feedback may come from anyone within the organization, whether from users, colleagues, supervisors, or other staff members. And finally, the profession provides feedback to the individual. All three, over time, make up the total picture. It must be noted, however, that it

is not necessary to have reached the "top" of the organization or professional association in order to conclude that you have had a career.

III. IS THERE SOMETHING WHICH DIFFERENTIATES PROFESSIONAL FROM NON-PROFESSIONAL CAREERS?

There are some distinguishing features, but they are difficult to express. In particular, two elements seem to characterize the distinction:

1) Weight on the four elements described in Question 1. For non-professionals, the weight would be primarily on the elements of time, focus and competence. Contribution would be reflected primarily on and in the job. "Contribution" is the key element which distinguishes a professional from other career; it implies that the professional owes something to the professional community.

2) Scope of contribution and competence. The professional has the opportunity to acquire a breadth of competencies as a result of education, professional contacts, and so on. These opportunities enable the professional to have a broader base and explore more options than the non-professional. The professional has greater opportunity to choose how to apply his skills and knowledge.

IV. ARE THERE ANY SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS PARTICULAR TO A CAREER IN LIBRARIANSHIP?

One characteristic which emerges is that librarians are probably more dependent on an organizational structure than are other professionals. An organization is required in order for most librarians to carry out their professions. It is true that there are now librarians who work independently, however, this is most often not the case. While other professionals, such as social workers, teachers, etc., also require an institutional setting in which to work, they are, by and large, less dependent on each other. Their respective functions are easier to define than those of librarians. The functions of librarians are many and varied: librarians are involved in a wide range of activities, from management, to systems operations, to bibliographic work, and so on. The final product is the result of joint, cooperative work. And the corollary to these statements is the interdependence among librarians. Library activities must be done in sequence, unlike work done by university faculty, for example.

V. WHAT DO THE LIBRARIAN AND THE ORGANIZATION HAVE IN COMMON?

They share assets and values. The individual contributes to the organization his own skill, knowledge, capabilities, potential, and expectations. Upon joining the organization, the individual, in turn, has access to the resources of the organization. Without the institution, the librarian could not "librarian." The librarian also inherits the library staff, the history of the organization, its image, and its reputation. These last elements may act to add to or detract from the individual's career growth and potential.

The individual and the organization must "select each other." From the standpoint of the individual, it is important to select very carefully the place with which you are going to associate yourself; institutions change slowly and it is your responsibility to make the right selection, even in a tight market.

VI. AFTER THE SELECTION HAS TAKEN PLACE, WHAT RESPONSIBILITIES DOES THE INDIVIDUAL HAVE AND WHAT RESPONSIBILITIES DOES THE ORGANIZATION HAVE? TO WHOM ARE THEY RESPONSIBLE?

The individual is responsible to himself for his total career direction, the length of this career, the quality of competencies, and the quality of his contributions. The individual is responsible to the institution for carrying out the assignment and responsibilities which he has accepted and for which he is paid.

The organization (i.e., management, at all levels) is responsible to the board of directors, public agencies, taxpayers, legislatures, university system, campus, etc. Management is responsible for personnel functions. It must recruit, select, train, develop, retain, promote, pay and otherwise motivate those persons who have joined the organization. Another important management function is that of "outplacing" - not keeping a person if the congruence between individual and organizational needs is lacking. This function includes screening, training, counseling, and evaluation.

VII. HOW DOES THE ORGANIZATION IMPLEMENT OR MEET THE RESPONSIBILITY TO KEEP AND MOTIVATE OR OUTPLACE AN INDIVIDUAL?

These functions are thought of as personnel functions. Policies, both written and unwritten, are the organization's way of providing for a degree of congruence between the objectives and needs of both parties. There is a great need for more meaningful communication between career employees and management about career development. Counseling, encouragement, educational opportunities, professional opportunities, incentive systems, evaluation processes and supervisorial training are all critical aspects of staff development programs. With respect to evaluation, UC is probably further along than many institutions, but there is still a great deal to do in this area. The responsibility of the individual for his own career is beginning to be recognized and this will be reflected in an increasing emphasis on self-evaluation, which ought to be an institutionalized part of the quest for congruence.

Q: The organization does not owe individuals a career, but the organization's greatest asset is people. Is this posture wasteful for the institution? If there is no support from the organization for things which individuals wish to do, how are these things to be achieved?

A: The individual is responsible for his WHOLE LIFE career. The organization is responsible for furthering this career during the time the individual is in the organization.

Q: Would it not be appropriate for management to sit down with employees and counsel them?

A: In so far as possible, the institution should create a climate in which real information is communicated between management and staff. Communication, based on mutually understood premises, is badly needed. Evaluation should be an on-going, cyclic event. When unit heads evaluate their own staff, the whole question of what is a legitimate way of collecting information comes up. To do it most effectively, you would have to know what are the significant interactions for the respective employee; those significant sources should then be the ones to provide information. The evaluation process is usually done in a much more fragmented way and information collected may be irrrelevant.

Q: We all have career goals, but the question of "Who will do my job? I don't have the time to do it," still remains.

A: This brings up the question of money for staff development. If you get funds for this purpose, how do you distribute the opportunities? Management has the responsibility to use funds as effectively as possible, with the objectives of the overall library operation in mind. Individuals may feel that money should be distributed equally to all employees. In the next 5 - 10 years, we are going to retrain individuals, and it is the responsibility of management to see that this is accomplished. Management may have to make trade-offs in order to do this. The UC library administration has a responsibility to make it possible for librarians to meet with professional groups; UC is geographically isolated and professional interaction is a necessary function of competence. Such management actions enhance the institution and the individual, though the latter effect is more incidental.

Q: It is not clear what the mechanism is by which conflicts over the investment of time or money between the individual and institutional goals are to be resolved. What has been the experience at UCLA?

A: There is a program of "special leaves." This is much like a sabbatical leave for faculty members. It allows the librarian time off with pay and has been granted even to those persons who work in small library units where staff is critical. On a minimal basis, management has tried to cover staffing positions left vacant by the special leave, but there is always a burden placed on the rest of the staff when one member is absent. In the past several years, about ten people have been granted special leave. These people have already reached the point at which they can make a contribution, but a real problem is helping people get that point.

Q: The Staff Development Committee at UCB has been agonizing over the question of how to spread the money equitably. Where are the necessary funds to be obtained?

A: Outside funding can augment state funding or leave. There are people who will give money for staff development and it is worthwhile trying to get it.

Q: When funding from outside sources is obtained, then the legislature cuts back its allocation for staff development, so the available monies are once again reduced.

A: This is not the experience at UCLA. Money collected from outside sources can go to a special UCLA foundation fund earmarked for staff development.

Comment: At UCB, we work with two pots of money: one from outside funding (assigned to the library by the Chancellor's Office) and one from the Library Staff Development Fund. As a matter of fact, few applications are received for money from the former fund.

A: Beginning employees are not able to ask for these special leaves because they are not yet at a stage to ask for it. Therefore, it is not at all surprising that the number of applications is low.

Q: Some individuals are more aggressive about seeking opportunities, leaves, etc. To what extent does the organization seek out those persons who are deserving of support but are less vocal? Is there an effort to equalize opportunities?

A: What you are talking about is an identification program. Through the Library Personnel Office, it is possible to identify such people and there is a responsibility on the part of management to do this to some extent. The question still remains, however, whether money is to be given to all persons, thereby reducing the amount overall.

A career implies some initiative. A person should take a "positive" position in getting opportunities. Some individuals are not taking as much responsibility for their careers as they could be.

Q: What about other forms of management to resolve these problems? I would rather see colleagues getting together to resolve problems for themselves.

What about "outplacing?" Is it possible to find a better job for a person if there is an absence of congruence between him and the present institution?

And finally, with regard to the evaluation process: how is the evaluation to be a balanced one as long as it is so closely linked to salary?

As a supervisor, one is often caught in the position of granting merit increases because there is no cost-of-living increase otherwise provided for the employee.

A: If you think of the Merit increase as a substitute for a cost of living increase, as a way of maintaining relative income you lose the whole point of the merit system which is based on evaluation of and reward for performance. It is certainly difficult to withhold a merit increase and to give an honest evaluation under any circumstances, doubly so when there are real financial problems, but to give an unearned merit increase on the basis of a less than honest evaluation cheats both the organization and the individual in the long run.

Q: Suppose people are in line for a promotion/merit increase, but there is no money. What happens?

A: The recommendation for a merit increase or promotion should not be dependent on the budget. The granting of a merit increase or promotion may be. I have never had to deal with this situation except in the case of special merits. There has always been sufficient money for promotions.

Q: In an evaluation process, one is sometimes encouraged to put in "negative" points for "balance" though they may be trivial. Some supervisors know how to write negatives which are really positive, but others have not mastered this technique. What is the solution to the need for negative comments?

A: The evaluation should contain, at the beginning, a statement of what is important for the evaluation; this is a step toward management-by-objective. Next, the evaluation should contain both positive and negative points which give a total evaluation of the person's performance as it relates to what he is supposed to be doing. Any system which relies on written evaluations cannot get away from the fact that some people write better than others. The requirement to assess both positive and negative aspects of performance is based on the assumption that people want and need to know about themselves and can improve their performance on the basis of such knowledge; this may or may not be true! Information, negative and positive should be geared to help improve performance.

Q: A librarian needs an organization in order to function and management relies on these individuals for the operation of the library. Is there then a trend to involve all personnel in management?

A: No. I do not believe that there is much of a trend in the sense of decision making by majority vote. The legitimate desire of individuals to become involved in and influence decisions might explain the whole committee explosion and the formation of LAUC as well as other forms of participation in management.

Q: Should the University Librarian really be an Executive Director of the Library? i.e. implement rather than initiate policy?

A: That is an interesting concept, I think there may be pressure towards that in the future, but it would involve a restructuring of the lines of accountability in public institutions.

Q: You spoke of the fact that some librarians are career-oriented and others are not. There should be a good balance between these two groups in any organization.

A: Such a differentiation would not be productive because people change. Looking back at my own career, I believe now that I had one, but while I was working, I did not consciously set out to have one. People are unpredictable and the level of consciousness with regard to pursuing a career is raised differently at different times. It is, for this reason, misleading to try to put people in these categories.

Q: Suppose there are persons who wish to be involved in professional associations and others who are just interested in performing the job within the organization. Is there some good balance between such types of individuals?

A: Again, there is no way to answer this question because people change. It is not necessary to be involved with professional associations in order to have a career and make contributions. Participation in such associations is merely a logical place in which such involvement can take place, but it is not the only way.

Q: In a recent McGill University study, there was an attempt to separate pay from evaluation. Can you comment on this concept?

A: This is one way to de-emphasize the evaluation/salary relation. The de-emphasis is attempted by placing the two functions apart in time. I'm not really sure that such a separation is effective. It would be interesting to explore the timing of evaluations: how often to evaluate whom? Evaluations are probably too frequent in some cases. One might even consider granting normal merit increases without an evaluation each time.

Comment: At McGill, the trend was an increase in the frequency of evaluations.

Q: Suppose evaluations go to an extreme in criticizing individuals?

A: People are unlikely to do this. It is difficult for most of us to give negative criticism and even more difficult to make it truly productive, but a merit system requires the effort.

Q: Does one have to find negative points in an evaluation?

A: No, definitely not! If someone is a "superwoman" or "superman," say so.

Q: With regard to seeking congruence of institutional aims and individual aims, what about upward career seeking which bounces a person around from one job to another?

A: Just as the institution has the responsibility to evaluate the suitability of a person to the organization, the individual is responsible for evaluating the institution. Actually, librarians tend not to move around and this is an impediment to the finding of congruence. It is wise to move around. Examine carefully the place in which you are working. In the first five years of your career, be mobile. If you can move around, do it.

Q: Moving around was at one time more common than it is now. Today job descriptions require such specific knowledge that they have to be filled from within.

A: Any institution needs infusions of new ideas and new people from the outside. One should not recruit for positions in a way that discriminates against outside applicants.

Research and the Inquiring Librarian

by

Gail Ann Schlachter

The aim of research, as I'm using the term, is to discover new facts or revise accepted conclusion, theories or laws. The test of research in my mind is whether or not it creates new knowledge, whether or not it extends the frontiers of what we know. Shera has fairly good, and often quoted, definition of the process of research. He says that in doing research, we identify problems; recognize any assumptions we need to make about the situation; collect data relevant to the problem; analyze the data, thereby rejecting, amending or accepting our original hypotheses, or estimates; and then reach a conclusion.

If we use this definition, then preparing a position paper, historically decribing an event, compiling a bibliography, or writing this speech does NOT qualify as research--although lots of time, effort, thought and care would go into each of these activities.

I am not minimizing these activities. I think they are just as important as those that grow out of the process of scientific investigation as described by Shera. It's just that they can't be labeled as "research." Labeled as "creative activity," yes. Eligible for credit under Academic Personnel Manual 51-4(e), yes. But research, no.

I don't feel that I'm dwelling on a semantic point here. As librarians, as literature searchers, as catalogers, we certainly know how important it is for us to be precise and consistent in our vocabularies. Other academicians in our environment use the term "research" in a definite and specific way. Experimental studies, sample surveys, system analysis, operations research, historical analysis --these are recognized as research.

So, we have to be very careful when we refer to our activities NOT to employ the term "research" generically or loosely. Few of us are engaged now, or will be in the future, in projects which could be labeled research. A distinction must be made between research and creative activities. One is NOT more important than the other. BOTH qualify for credit in 51-4(e). But the terms denote different activities. And we must be careful to select the term which correctly identifies our intent.

After thinking about my topic, and all the comments that could be made about research, I decided to arrange my remarks into three separate but not necessarily mutually exclusive categories: research as it relates to the profession; research as it relates to individual libraries, and research as it relates specifically to us as librarians.

In 1967, the editors of Wilson Library Bulletin decided to devote an entire issue of their journal to the most important problem facing the American library profession. Did they write about manpower resources? Cooperation? New technology? No. With one mental blow, they dismissed these all--and singled out for their report the need for qualified research in librarianship.

For if we, as a field, are to know ourselves, are to invent the future rather than be swept along into it, we must support and engage in productive research. In view of our present turbulent and unpredictable environment in librarianship, research is no longer a luxury for the profession. It is vital, if we are to solve professional problems; to develop tools and methods for analysis of organizations, services and behavior; to determine the costs and benefits of our services; to establish or develop a theory on which to base practice; or to provide the field with paradigms of radically new conceptualizations of library phenomena.

Unfortunately, the field of librarianship lacks a research tradition. Even if we are charitable and say that research in the field of librarianship is in its infancy, then we would still have to add almost immediately that the infant is not particularly lusty. It's only in the past 40 years that the field has supported doctoral programs, research journals or research organizations. If you scoured the library writings, including doctoral papers, you'd find that only 10 to 20 percent of them qualify as research. Library schools do not offer a research major in a master's degree program. In fact, most library school students escape without ever having had a course in scientific methodology or investigation.

It is ironic that librarianship--a profession so experienced in locating and preserving the researches of others--should have so little involvement and investment in research in its own field. Actually, it's not only library research that we seem to hold in small regard, but many aspects of librarianship. We are busy compiling bibliographies for other subject areas, but there is no commercially available guide to the reference literature of librarianship. We are committed to machine access to bibliographic citations and KWIC indexing, but look at the titles we give articles in Library Journal and Wilson Library Bulletin. For example, some years ago an article was written about our failure to provide machine indexable titles in library literature and what was it entitled? The Shoemaker's Children! Think about your hit rate with a title like that!

This lack of regard for library research first struck me when I was working on my Ph.D. in Library Science at the University of Minnesota. I found it extremely difficult to check out whether my dissertation topic (professional librarians' interest in employee association--especially unions) had already been studied, or to find any other doctoral studies which might contain related information. I became even more accutely aware of this particular problem when I taught Research Methods at USC and my students needed to locate relevant research studies. Doctoral dissertations, obviously, represent the largest and most cohesive body of research studies available in the field. And yet, it was almost impossible for my students to access them. There was no one central location where a researcher could secure complete and accurate information on doctoral studies related to library science. Instead, they needed to use a combination of bibliographic listings, such as those in Dissertation Abstracts International, Library Literature, and Library Quarterly. However, neither individually nor totally did these tools offer a complete record of library doctoral research. In an effort to fill this gap, Dennis Thomison (from the USC Library School faculty) and I prepared an annotated guide to doctoral studies in library science. Harkening back to the statements I made earlier in this talk, let me emphasize that by no means could this Schlachter-Thomison activity be labeled as research. Creative? I like to think so. Valuable? I certainly hope so. But, research? Never.

Librarians are in the strange position of being impoverished in a land of riches. We can plot with accuracy for patrons the Sea of Tranquility and plumb the intricacies of the DNA molecule upon request, but we cannot say with much certainty how to maximize library service in a decentralized system, what percent of the student body should be supplied with reader stations, how to identify materials for remote storage, or if the frequency of use justifies the cost of giving collation on a catalog card.

Even when such information is available, we generally lack the research orientation to look for it or, if we know it's there, to use it making decisions or setting policies. For example, I know that many library educators have read the follow-up that Dennis and I did on the library science doctoral recipient, in which several rather surprising and significant findings for library education were reported, and yet I wonder if any of the information presented there has affected library school policies. Dennis and I took the quantifiable information we had available to us from our library science bibliography and investigated several factors related to the pursuit and acquisition of the doctoral degree: the attrition rate in the library field compared to other areas of doctoral study, the completion rate of different types of research methodologies, and a longitudinal survey of type of doctoral paper written. The really important aspect of this study, which was published in 1975 in the Journal of Education for Librarianship, was our review of the positions currently held by recipients of library doctoral degrees. As you are undoubtedly aware, library education goes to great lengths to provide a dual path of doctoral preparation. D.L.S. degrees are offered to prepare library administrators and Ph.D. degrees to prepare library educators/researchers. It only makes sense to maintain these parallel tracks if those trained as administrators then work in administration and those trained as educators/researchers then work in those areas. However, after analyzing data on all identified recipients of doctoral degrees for studies relating to librarianship, we found no correlation at all between type of training and type of position currently held. We feel this study has serious ramifications for library education and yet we can find no evidence that these findings have affected the structure of library education. I have often thought, in fact, that a really interesting research project would be to investigate to what extent research findings are ever implemented in the operation of our field.

In general, librarians have a tendency to think of research in rather elitist terms--as something that's done separate and apart from the daily work situation--done in a kind of hushed environment by specialists considering problems of awesome proportions. In a recent issue of the California Librarian, Tom Shaughnessy (who is currently the Assistant Dean of the Library School at USC) exemplified this view when he concluded that library research was best conducted by trained specialists working out of research centers housed in library schools.

Well, I agree that research at this level and with this approach is certainly valuable to the field. But to think of research only in this way--as a process that results in publications, done in specialized locations is, in my mind, not only elitist and separatist but down right dangerous for the field.

Let's go back again to Shera's definition of the process of research: you identify a problem; understand all of its aspects; collect relevant data; analyze the information; and reach some conclusion based on the analysis. In fact, what we've just done here is not only to define the research process, but to describe the decision making sequence. We are faced all the time with problems for which we have to come up with solutions. Many times, we count on hunches, assumptions,

intuition, guesswork and prior experience to make decisions. There isn't the time or the money or the opportunity or the need for anything else.

But there are many times when we ought to research (and I use that term deliberately here) the situation, when we ought to stop and clearly define the problem, objectively collect relevant information, analyze that information and use the process--the research process--to make decisions. It is a mistaken notion to think that research is conducted in a cosmic sense only. It is appropriate that we take a research approach in our daily work situations.

One of the things that has long concerned me is the field's general reluctance to objectively assess their services and operations. We subjectively measure activities and policies all the time. Some say, "It's better to have a divided catalog for our patrons than a dictionary catalog." "No," others say, "it's better to have a dictionary catalog than a divided catalog." Some say, "It makes more sense to have journals in classified rather than in alphabetical order." "No," others repond, "it makes more sense to have them in alphabetical order." And so on.

But how do we know? Rarely do libraries attempt to study the usefulness or successfulness of their programs. In a survey of public libraries in California which I conducted in 1975 (published in a recent issue of the California Librarian), I found that less than 15 percent of the libraries studied ever measured the effectiveness of their activities. Fortunately, or perhaps unfortunately for our professional conscience, it is not possible to make decisive judgments about the quality of an individual library's performance--it's not possible to engage in program evaluation--if we don't know what the objectives of the institution are. And, in most libraries, the values, objectives, and goals are infrequently articulated and rarely written down.

If I were to take a poll of librarians in the UC system, practically everyone in our group would claim to support the concept and need for research, and the need to disseminate useful findings collected in the research process. It is of some professional concern, then, that of all the libraries I studied for program evaluation activities, not one of the libraries which had conducted a user survey or engaged in evaluation research had sent in a copy of their results to the ERIC system. How often do you, upon the completion of a committee or in-house investigation share with the field the results of your study through the ERIC system?

But to return to our hypothetical poll, undoubtedly there would be some who would say that librarianship is an art and that any attempt to firm it up, analyze it, or measure its activities would be inappropriate. But, in general, most of you would agree that for the field to move forward, we need to be able to predict with some certainty which of the many paths is best to follow.

The real question--the one that touches us close to home, close to our professional commitments, if not to mention our pocketbook, is: what should be, what is expected to be our role in conducting research and creative activities.

Sections 82 and 51-4 of the Academic Personnel Manual say that after excellence on the job has been established, research and creative projects are one of three categories of activities considered in promotion and salary action decisions.

I feel it is absolutely imperative that the optional nature of research and crea-

tive products be protected. It would be disastrous if policy actions and promotions became hinged upon publications.

Publications, whether they are based on research or not, are time consuming and not infrequently expensive to do. I've heard people say that if we had the same arrangement as faculty members then things would be different. We would have more time to do research and other creative activities. Having been a faculty member for three years, I don't quite share the same view. While it is true that I only taught 9 hours a week, I spent another 20-25 reading student work and preparing for class, another 5 hours in organizational meetings, and another 10 hours a week in office hours, advising students and providing student assistance (which, if you have been keeping count, already totals more than 40 hours), not to mention the time spent attending workshops, preparing for new courses or new approaches to current courses, and doing my own research and publication which, in the faculty world, is a required criterion for retention or promotion. This time expenditure is evidently not unique to my faculty situation. In a survey conducted last year of faculty work loads across the country, it was reported that the average faculty member spends 60 hours a week on job related activities. As faculty members, I don't think you have more time, just more opportunity to control what you do at a particular time.

If there were a magic formula which allowed you to churn out publications or immerse yourself in research and not cut dramatically into your off-the-job time, I would turn it over to you on the spot. But I have never been able to find a way around this. To produce good publications, to do good research, we just have to work, at least a substantial part of the time, off the job.

I am absolutely in favor of the various recommendations made by the LAUC Committee on Privileges, Salaries and Conditions of Employment: 30 day leaves with pay should be given for approved research and other activities and librarians should be able to obtain finite weekly blocks of release time for approved projects. Although not mentioned in the report, we should definitely consider more widespread use of alternative work schedules. But these are only band-aid approaches. For most projects, it simply will be necessary to absorb the immediate time costs on our own time in expectation of future payoffs to our field, our library and ourselves because of the research or publications we produced.

There are other obstacles, in addition to time pressures, to performing research or preparing other creative projects. Not everyone is interested in these activities. This limitation is not unique to librarianship. There are intelligent and intellectual people in every profession and research is not the preference of all of them. We all know numerous doctors and lawyers who are excellent at their work, keep up to date in their field through continuing education programs, but don't engage in research. If you think about it logically, of course, library research and library publication do not automatically result in improved library performance. If a librarian is not a skilled listner, no amount of research or publication in a particular subject area will improve the quality of the librarian's reference interview. If a librarian lacks organization at work, no amount of research or publication in a particular subject area will increase the quantity of materials cataloged--or the quality of cataloging materials outside of the area of the research (which is usually quite limited). There is no question that research and publication make a librarian more knowledgeable about a subject or set of subjects. But knowing is not performing.

There are many faculty members who are well known scholars and authorities in their fields but who are unable to effectively communicate their information in a classroom. Good research and prolific publication do not MAKE good faculty members. Similarly, good research and prolific publications do not MAKE good librarians. Research and publication may help us get promoted and, done well, they certainly help the structure and prestige of the field and the librarians' institution, but there doesn't seem to be any basis to argue that research and/or publication will result in improved individual performance.

The research process, however, is another thing. The pattern that Shera describes, that willingness, that insistence that conclusions be based on evidence objectively gathered and analyzed--whether the end product is a research study or a decision made at work--that process in my mind is crucial to the success of the field and the operation of our libraries.

But how many of us are able to do this type of analysis or publication? Since most of us come out of the liberal arts, particularly English and History, we may feel comfortable with historical analysis and bibliographic compilation, but what about scientific analysis and decision making? Where were we trained for that? Generally not in our undergraduate careers, because of the majors we followed. Usually not in our library school experiences; with only a one year shot, library schools have tended to be concerned with the preparation of librarians as technical practitioners. Statistical analysis, stochastic processes, delphi techniques, heuristic models, regression analysis, monte carlo techniques--these are rarely covered. Consequently, the library masters degree curriculum generally does not provide any counter balance to the basically anti-empirical backgrounds from which many of us come. Thus, even if we could devote the time needed to do research and publication, even if we had the money many of these studies take and the interest in doing this type of work, many of us would lack the background, knowledge and skill--the training to do this type of activity.

Where can we obtain the background necessary to conduct research or follow the research process? Not everyone can or wants to go back to library school for formal courses. But there are numerous other avenues open to us. We can take advantage of the rich assortment of courses available on our own campus. We can encourage professional associations to provide workshops and training sessions. We can pool our knowledge and share our experience. Following the model established at Ohio State University, described last year in the Journal of Academic Librarianship, we can set up an Advisory Committee on Research to help acquire funds for librarians' research, advise on appropriate research methodologies for librarian-initiated projects, refer research ideas to potentially interested librarians, and assist in proposal writing. We can read and study on our own. Above all, we must recognize that we have a responsibility to the field of librarianship to acquire the skills and knowledge which will enable us to operate if not as active creators then at least as intelligent consumers and critics of library research.

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

Q: In Europe there are several great scholars who are also librarians. They are widely recognized as subject specialists and they engage in a variety of scholarly pursuits. Why is this type of librarian lost in this country?

A: Service is not stressed in Europe. Responsibilities of librarians in Europe and the U.S. are completely different. In the U.S., almost all of a librarian's time is dedicated to library activities. This is not true of the "scholarly" librarians in Europe.

Q: There are many times when it is obvious that program evaluation should be performed. Why isn't there a sub-specialty within the library schools which could be called upon to assist librarians when the need arises?

A: There are consultant groups: one at Denver at the present time, and plans are underway at USC to create a consultant group. The real problem is that library schools lack a commitment to research and this has led outside agencies and professionals to rush in to fill the gap. The role for librarians is shrinking as they permit outside agencies to make the decisions.

Q: Can adequate training in research techniques be incorporated into a one-year library program?

A: According to library curriculum goals as envisioned by the speaker, there would be time to incorporate training in this area. There is a need to re-examine goals and competencies expected for the MLS student. Certain traditional "core" courses should be replaced by training in information handling, administration (i.e., not from the standpoint of the director of a library, but rather from the perspective of the individual working in an organization), and decision-making. How to make decisions involves training in research methodology.

Q: What is being done at UC Davis to rectify the situation?

A: There will be some programs offered in the near future. At Berkeley librarians have access to some of the finest courses in methodology. It should be re-stated, however, that research should not be a required part of the job. The world does not need more publications, it needs publications and research of high quality. The main use of research methodology should be for decision-making in library operation.

Q: Does Davis grant leave for librarians to do research?

A: Ten percent of the workweek (or 4 hours) are allocated for professional development activities. This time can be spent in whatever way the individual wishes.

Q: What is the difference between research and program evaluation?

A: Program evaluation is a component of research and employs a specific methodology.

Q: As a final question, could you share with the audience some of your thoughts on unionism vs. professionalism, a topic on which you did your doctoral dissertation and subsequent research?

A: Unions have been involved in libraries for a long time, however, the number of persons involved in them has remained fairly static. Despite the fact that librarians recognize the power of collective action, there is hesitancy in joining the unions since it is felt that they will not reflect their professional interests as well as the organizations to which they already belong (e.g., ALA).

Collective action will become increasingly necessary and it would be desirable for professional organizations, such as the ALA, to add "employee interests" to their charges. If this is not done, the fate of the professional organizations is, at best, uncertain. If these groups fail to speak with a collective voice, it is likely that they will eventually be replaced by unions.